

REMARKS

GENERALLY

A Final Office Action was issued 06/27/2006. The Final Office Action examined claims 1-13 and 19-35. It rejected all of claims 1-13 and 19-35.

In response to the Final Office Action, an After-Final Reply was filed on 08/14/2006. Although some of the claims were amended to address alleged §112 (second paragraph) issues, they were not amended as a result of any applied art.

In response to the After-Final Reply of 08/14/2006, an Advisory Action was issued 08/29/2006. The Advisory Action appeared to indicate that the After-Final Reply was entered and considered. The After-Final Reply apparently overcame the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections. However, the Advisory Action indicated that the After-Final Reply was not persuasive with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections.

It is therefore believed that the After-Final Reply, including the claim amendments, have been entered by the Patent Office. Accordingly, the claim amendments presented in the previous Reply are included in the claims above, but they are not separately indicated with any strikethrough or underlining markings.

This current Reply is responsive to the Advisory Action, and it also serves as a Preliminary Amendment for an RCE. In this current Reply, no claims are canceled or added. Hence, claims 1-13 and 19-35 continue to be pending and presented for examination.

However, each of the five independent claims is amended. These independent claims are claims 1, 6, 12, 19, and 25.

1 RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

2
3 Generally, the Final Office Action rejected all pending claims 1-13 and 19-
4 35.

5 Specifically, the Final Office Action rejected the claims as follows:

6 5. Claims 1-13 and 19-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
7 102(e)/103(a) as being anticipated by/unpatentable over Aharoni et al. (US
8 6,014,694), hereafter "Aharoni".

9 28. Claim 1 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) as
10 being anticipated by/unpatentable over McCanne et al. (Receiver-driven Layered
11 Multicast, ACM SIGCOMM'96, August 96), hereinafter "McCanne".

12 32. Claim 12 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being
13 unpatentable over McCanne in view of Borella et al. (US 6,587,433), hereinafter
14 "Borella".

15 35. Claims 6, 19, and 25 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)
16 as being anticipated by Gai et al. (US 6,651,101), herein after "Gai".

17 As explained in the previous After-Final Reply, it is respectfully submitted
18 that the claims prior to the amendments herein were and are patentable. In short,
19 even assuming, *arguendo*, that the art of record teaches feedback from a client
20 device, none of the art of record teaches responding to interaction from a user of the
21 client device. Nevertheless, to facilitate prosecution and to expedite the ultimate
22 allowance of the instant Patent Application, the claims have been amended as
23 indicated herein.

24 The pending claims, after entry of this current Reply, include element(s)
25 involving (i) selection of a particular video object by a user interaction at a remote
device and (ii) classification of information responsive to this selection and/or
association of a service class to information based on this selection. Support for the

1 amendments may be found, for example, in Section 1.2 on pages 14-15 of the
2 originally-filed Patent Application.

3 In short, it is respectfully submitted that no art of record, either alone or in
4 any combination, anticipates or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in
5 conjunction with the other elements of their respective claims:

6
7 Claim 1: generating at least one corresponding elementary stream comprising
8 the compressed video objects . . . classifying information within each
9 elementary stream based on importance and *responsive to a particular*
10 *video object that is selected by at least one user interaction via a*
11 *remote device* that is operatively coupled across a network.

12 Claim 6: generating resource coordination information based at least in part
13 on [...] on one or more *prioritizing parameters associated with a*
14 *particular video object that is selected by a user interaction via a*
15 remote device that is operatively coupled to a network . . . selectively
16 associating each packet of content information with a service class
17 selected from among at least two different service classes based on the
18 resource coordination information.

19 Claim 12: generating prioritization information based at least in part on [...]
20 one or more *prioritizing parameters associated with a particular video*
21 *object that is selected from the media information by a user*
22 *interaction* via a remote device that is operatively coupled to a
23 network . . . associating packets of the media information with a
24 service class selected from a plurality of different service classes based
25 on the prioritization information.

1 Claim 19: collaborator logic operatively coupled to the packetizer logic and
2 configured to receive [...] *one or more prioritizing parameters*
3 *associated with a particular video object that is selected by a user*
4 *interaction* via a remote device that is operatively coupled to a
5 network; the collaborator logic further configured to output resource
6 coordination information based at least in part on [...] the one or more
7 prioritizing parameters associated with the particular video object . . .
8 priority mapping logic operatively coupled to the collaborator logic to
9 receive the resource coordination information and [...] configured to
10 selectively associate each received packet of content information with
11 a service class selected from among at least two different service
12 classes based on the resource coordination information

13 Claim 25: *the second host device receiving a user interaction comprising*
14 *selection of a particular video object . . . a plurality of application-*
15 *aware resource controllers including a first application-aware resource*
16 *controller operatively configured within the first access network [...],*
17 *wherein the first application-aware resource controller is configured*
18 *[...] to map the aggregated information to at least two service classes*
19 *selected from a group of two or more different service classes based at*
20 *least in part on one or more prioritizing parameters associated with the*
21 *selection of the particular video object.*

1 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, 12, 19, and 25 have
2 been provided above. Claims 2-5/33, 7-11, 13/34, 20-24, and 26-32/35 depend from
3 the independent claims 1, 6, 12, 19, and 25, respectively. Although each also
4 includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, it is respectfully
5 submitted that these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given
6 above in connection with their respective independent claims.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims 1-13 and 19-35 are allowable, and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.

As noted above, a Request for an Examiner Interview accompanies submission of the current Reply. More specifically, an "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form" PTOL-413A is being submitted herewith. **Applicants' representative requests that the Examiner Interview occur prior to issuance of another Office Action.** Applicants' representative will be available on a day and at a time of the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/25/2006

By: Keith W. Saunders
Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 x238